

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 8 to 15 are pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the acknowledgment that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

II. Rejection of Claims 8 to 15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 8 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,823,738 ("Wlodarczyk et al."). It is respectfully submitted that Wlodarczyk et al. does not anticipate the present claims for at least the following reasons.

To anticipate a claim, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). That is, the prior art must describe the elements arranged as required by the claims. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claim 8 relates to a sheathed-element glow plug for an internal combustion engine, including, *inter alia*, a plug shell; a glow element electrically connected to the plug shell; an integrated pressure sensor; and at least one elastic element situated between an inner surface of the plug shell and the glow element. Claim 8 further includes the features of *the elastic element forming an electrical contact both to a part of the inner surface of the plug shell and to a part of a surface of the glow element, the elastic element being deformable when a force acts on the glow element, and the elastic element permitting a relative movement between the glow element and the plug shell.*

Wlodarczyk et al. does not identically disclose, or even suggest, all of the claimed features of claim 8. Instead, Wlodarczyk et al. merely indicates a fiber-optic sensor 34 integrated with a conventional glow plug 36. (Wlodarczyk et al., col.

4, lines 19 to 21). The glow plug 36 of Wlodarczyk et al. includes a channel 50 and a notch 46 to accommodate the fiber-optic sensor 34 and its leads. (Wlodarczyk et al., col. 4, lines 46 to 51). However, nowhere does Wlodarczyk et al. identically disclose, or even suggest, the feature of *the elastic element forming an electrical contact both to a part of the inner surface of the plug shell and to a part of a surface of the glow element*, as provided for in the context of claim 8. In fact, Wlodarczyk et al. does not mention forming any electrical contacts by the fiber-optic sensor 34 disposed in the channel 50 between the sensor body 42 and the electrode 40. In addition, nowhere does Wlodarczyk et al. identically disclose, or even suggest, the feature of *the elastic element being deformable when a force acts on the glow element*, as provided for in the context of claim 8. In this regard, Wlodarczyk et al. does not mention any connection between the fiber-optic sensor 34 and the electrode 40, and therefore, a force acting on the electrode 40 will not result in a deformation of the fiber-optic sensor 34. In fact, Wlodarczyk et al. states that the notch 46 allows combustion chamber pressures to impact the fiber-optic sensor 34 directly. (Wlodarczyk et al., col. 4, lines 48 to 49). Further, nowhere does Wlodarczyk et al. identically disclose, or even suggest, the feature of *the elastic element permitting a relative movement between the glow element and the plug shell*, as provided for in the context of claim 8. In this regard, Wlodarczyk et al. does not mention any relative movement between the sensor body 42 and the electrode 40 of its conventional glow plug 36, and the fiber-optic sensor 34 does not change the conventional structure of the glow plug 36 of Wlodarczyk et al.

Accordingly, Wlodarczyk et al. does not identically disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 8. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Wlodarczyk et al. does not anticipate claim 8.

As for claims 9 to 15, which depend from and therefore include all of the features included in claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that Wlodarczyk et al. does not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 18, 2008

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/ (Reg. No. 42,194) for
Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646